



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

IBM CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
11400 BURNET ROAD
AUSTIN TX 78758

COPY MAILED

JAN 25 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Lita et al. :
Application No. 09/282,633 :
Filed: March 31, 1999 :
Attorney Docket No. AUS919990088US1 :

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), filed November 27, 2006, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The petition satisfies the conditions for revival pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that (1) the reply in the form of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and an Amendment; (2) the petition fee; and (3) the required statement of unintentional delay have been received. Accordingly, the response has been accepted as having been unintentionally delayed.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the instant petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed solely to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

It is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center 2100 for processing of the Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114 filed with the instant petition.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3206.

Liana Walsh
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

Cc: STEPHEN A. TERRILE
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720